

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-10 and 46-52 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 10 have been amended. Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claims 47-52 have been newly added. Applicants believe that this Amendment does not add new matter. In view of the foregoing Amendment and following Remarks, allowance of all the pending claims is requested.

Applicants do not disclaim the subject matter of any canceled or amended claims and expressly reserve the right to prosecute such subject matter, or any other subject matter supported by the Specification, in one or more continuation or divisional applications.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-10 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,778,187 to Monteiro et al. ("Monteiro"). Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the reason that Monteiro does not disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

For example, claim 1 recites: *"wherein the turnstile is configured to perform a first authentication on a ticket for the event received by the associated participant to locally determine whether the ticket is a valid ticket;"* and *"wherein the participant manager logically connected to the turnstile is further configured to perform a second authentication to determine whether the valid ticket is authentic."*

The Examiner appears to allege that the "user software" of Monteiro is equivalent to the turnstile of the claimed invention. The Examiner also appears to allege that the "user object" of Monteiro is equivalent to the ticket of the claimed invention. However, assuming that these associations are correct, which Applicants do not concede, the Examiner has failed to show that the "user software" of Monteiro is configured to perform a first authentication on a "user object" for the event received by the associated participant to locally determine whether the "user object" is a valid "user object".

Monteiro apparently describes that an administration server, and not the user software, receives the "user object" and makes validity determinations regarding user information (Monteiro at column 13, lines 27-36). By contrast, per various

embodiments of Applicants' invention, the *turnstile is configured to perform a first authentication on a ticket* for the event received by the associated participant to *locally determine whether the ticket is a valid ticket*. Clearly, Monterio fails to disclose that the "user software" *locally* determines whether the "user object" is a valid "user object". For at least this reason, Monteiro fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, the rejection thereto is improper and must be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Examiner appears to allege that the "media server" of Monteiro is equivalent to the participant manager of the claimed invention. However, assuming that this association is correct, which Applicants do not concede, Monteiro fails to disclose that the "media server" logically connected to the "user software" is further configured to perform a second authentication to determine whether the valid "user object" is authentic. There is no disclosure of a second authentication being performed to determine whether the valid "user object" is authentic, much less, by the media server. For at least this reason, Monteiro fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, the rejection thereto is improper and must be withdrawn.

Claims 4-10 and 46 each depend from and add features to claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, the rejections to claims 4-10 and 46 are likewise improper and must be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 3, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Monteiro in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,308,208 to Jung et al. ("Jung"). Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the reason that the Examiner has failed to show that the references relied upon teach or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

For example, as discussed above, Monteiro does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Jung fails to cure the deficiencies of Monteiro. Claims 2 and 3 each depend from and add features to claim 1. Therefore, the combination of Monteiro and Jung, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the features of claims 2 and 3 and the rejections thereto must be withdrawn.

Newly Added Claims 47-52

Claims 47-52 each depend from and add features to claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, claims 47-52 are allowable.

Conclusion

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

October 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Nidhi Chotani

Nidhi Chotani

Registration No. 59,924

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703-770-7900
Fax: 703-770-7901